Route 12 - Old Receiver Road
Frederick, Md. 21701

May 17, 1976

Honorable Richard Schweiker
United States Senate
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Dick:

I have followed in silence and sorrow your and Senator Hart's recent public statements. Regardless of what your report will say if and when it appears, regardless of what is in your minds or whatever intentions you may have for the future, I do have deep regrets. When your statements are stripped to their essence, you do not claim to have made any investigation of the most central of all fact. Yet, without even claiming to have made this investigation, you have gone for the self-serving line of the agencies you are to have investigated.

I am not making a claim of omniscience or infallibility, nor am I claiming to know what you may have learned in the course of your work.

I am reminding you that when we met last October I expressed the belief that more theorizing is the last thing the country needs and was the least likely to be helpful to your stated purposes with which, of course, I was in accord. However, on the theories you and Senator Hart now express, I then suggested that you issue certain subpoenas. Had they been issued and complied with, these doubts would have been resolved to the degree possible. But now, months later, from your public statements you have not yet reached that beginning point.

When some of this stuff was being spoonfed, I wrote you that one aspect of it was not true. What I was referring to is what had appeared in public. My reason for calling it untrue is that I had the results of an official investigation which declare it to be untrue.

Then at the time David Martin's AP story on the Rocca memo appeared, I wrote you further, suggesting it might be helpful if I could go over these materials. It soon turned out you had no need to keep them in confidence because CIA had released them. Since then my own situation and work have made it impossible for me to drop everything and go over these 1466 pages. I have gone over some. I tell you, intending nothing personal at all, that if one can evaluate what your subcommittee has taken from these papers by anything said in public, you have not understood them.

Returning to the Brazilian embassy episode, I have read Mr. Rocca's use of the Harker story which seems to have influenced you and Senator Hart very much. There is no doubt that one justified interpretation is consistent with what you and Senator Hart seem to believe. There is also no doubt that it is not the only interpretation. I believe his omission of all else should have raised questions.

I am not without experience in intelligence analysis. For whatever my opinion is worth, I characterize what Mr. Rocca did - and what the CIA intended - as a work of propaganda and not one of analysis.

So you can decide for yourself whether my belief is at all justified, reread Rocca on the Harke~~h~~2story and ask yourself if what Mr. Rocca does not mention could fairly be ignored: Castro said that without an end to the violation of the October 1962 agreement World War III was possible.

A little political understanding might go with this. The October 1962 agreement guaranteed that the United States would prevent any such attacks on Cuba. Ask yourself whether or not those Mr. Rocca refers to as entirely independent Cubans were independent, were not connected with the CIA and were not subject to U.S. control.

My purpose in this is neither to fight with nor to offend you or Senator Hart. It is an explanation of dismay, disappointment and apprehension. These are magnified by your unwillingness to confront a contrary view I think it is not unfair to describe as informed, particularly when you know that I was willing to take whatever time you wanted even when I was in severe pain.

I am sorry about all of this for the country, for what it means in terms of the perpetuation of this great trauma and for whatever history's writing finger may inscribe about you and Senator Hart because from my one meeting with you I was confident of the seriousness of your purposes.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg